

not merely an instinctive action nor a flip-pant gesture to keep up with the Joneses.

The Armenians have good reason to be concerned about the fate of the nation, perhaps a little more than any other nationality group of kindred fate, because they are small in numbers, and weak in might, and because they have been buffeted by fate far more than any other nation and they are desperately trying to prevent national extinction.

There are things going on inside the Iron Curtain these days. There are things going on in Soviet Armenia of which the world should be informed. The very life of the Armenian Nation is being threatened with a peril which is far more deadly than the famine, the epidemic and the massacre.

It is the peril of national dissolution. It is blatant Russification.

One after another, the bastions of national identity are being demolished. Religion, the foundation of the Armenian people which enabled them to survive 2,000 years has been eradicated in Armenia and has been replaced by atheism.

Nationalism, patriotism, have been ruthlessly suppressed and replaced by international communism.

Our language has been hideously disfigured with the rushing influx of Russian words, an atrocious hodgepodge of bilingualism. One needs a new Armenian dictionary these days to decipher the foreign words.

Culture is denounced as formalistic and the artists of Armenia are closely watched lest they deviate, the result being that artistic growth is stifled.

And now, as the capstone of this false structure, comes the so-called fraternal union of the Caucasian S.S.R. Communist Parties—Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan—which have been merged into the trans-caucasian bureau, doing away with native party leadership.

The pattern is being implemented in other parts of the Soviet Union—Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, etc.

And this liquidation of the nationalities is being done in the name of "the brotherhood of the nation," in the name of the "common land" and the "common fatherland" which, in reality, is destined to become "common Russia" with Russian language, culture, and ideology.

This is the beginning of the end—the disintegration of the nationalities of the Soviet Union.

As regards Armenia, with the relaxation of the former repressions, of late there had been indications of a national awakening.

Voices were being heard in Armenia, voices which no one dared raise in the days of the infamous Stalin.

The poet Hovhanness Shiraz sings of the nostalgia of the "old home on the other side of the border." The academician, Karapetyan, writes a stringing rebuttal to a Polish Communist writer who apologized for the Turk and the Soviet by contending that "The confiscation of Armenian historic territories by Turkey, Georgia, and Azerbaijan was a historic necessity in the interests of world communism."

And now the Soviet cudgel is descending heavily on Shiraz and Karapetyan and others, as "chauvinists" and "imperialistic reactionaries."

The Communist Party in Armenia is alarmed and puts the blame on the Armenian Revolutionary Federation.

There is every indication that a reversal to the Stalin era is in the offing in Armenia. There will be persecutions and purges. The revival of the national spirit will be ruthlessly suppressed.

With religion gone, language gone, and now the territorial demarcations gone, Armenia is in danger of complete dissolution.

The Christian West failed Armenia in the days of Abdul Hamid.

Will history repeat itself? Will the free West stand by passively and watch with indifference as Armenia is being crucified the second time?

Although this editorial directs attention to the abuse being suffered by the Armenian minority in the Soviet Union, the practices of the Soviet Government are consistently applied to the other nationality groups under Soviet control. By destroying the identities of the captive nations the Soviet Union hopes to perpetuate its control over their lands and reduce the resistance that they are continually demonstrating.

Having recently commemorated Captive Nations Week, it is well for us to ponder the sinister implications of conditions within the Soviet Union as related to the foreign policy goals of the Communists. We should be forewarned and concerned with the dangerous trap that is being laid for us in Moscow.

#### SOMBER REMINDER: IRON CURTAIN STILL THERE

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. Bow) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, largely forgotten are millions of people still behind the Iron Curtain under Soviet domination. Since 1959 the U.S. Congress has set aside a week of the year as Captive Nations Week, during which the President makes a proclamation calling for the liberation of peoples under Communist bondage.

The President did so this year although, curiously, at a time when an accommodated agreement on atmospheric nuclear testing seemed imminent. Perhaps the proclamation was less than enthusiastic for fear it would irritate the Communists and foul the negotiations. If so, the somber tone of Captive Nations Week became even more somber.

During Captive Nations Week last week, we were reminded that all of Eastern Europe is under Soviet domination 18 years after World War II, as is most of Asia.

Lands which for years provided the United States with the riches of immigration now are under Communist rule. They were given the Communist yoke at the conference table where the wily and artful Communists outsmarted U.S. negotiators.

Despite talk that parts of the Communist world are independent of Russia, Communists argue only over the best means of destroying the free nations.

Within the Communist bloc is little evidence of freedom, a break in foreign policy with Soviet Union, or any change in the ideology of planned victory over capitalism. Under communism everywhere the individual person is but an ant-like slave in a mass society.

Yet there are strong indications that the policy of peaceful coexistence is now the policy of the U.S. Government. While no one wants war, the easiest way to get into war is to encourage the enemy to think we are soft and will make accommodations and concessions.

After Captive Nations Week it is especially appropriate to think through this question:

Have we resigned ourselves to accept Communist rule for these Nations?

If the answer is "No," and I hope it is, an equally important question remains: What can we do to aid the people who have lost their freedom?

First, we can all stand for a firm policy against communism, opposing agreements and treaties which would legalize Communist rule in Eastern Europe, Cuba, and the Far East.

Second, we can aid refugee organizations and national groups in their efforts to present their case for freedom and regain their homelands if opportunity comes. Tragically, we missed such an opportunity to do so in Cuba when we let Cubans die on the beaches of the Bay of Pigs without our promised air strikes.

Third, we can step up efforts in the United Nations to get neutral nations to condemn the real imperialism, the real colonialism in the world—the Soviet Communist empire.

If the United Nations is to be useful, it must be a center where tragic problems like this can be brought to light and discussed.

Fourth, we can stop aiding Communist governments. We can cut off the trade concessions, free steel mills, and free food. We can withhold aid for the day when the oppressed people overthrow their masters.

The United States won its independence from Britain with strong help from nations across the seas. One of these was Poland.

Let us not forget Poland and the other captive nations in their own hour of misery—but let our aid be to the open hand of freedom, not to the mailed fist of dictatorship.

#### PITFALLS OF THE MOSCOW PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

(Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. Bow) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we will be hearing much about the alleged advantages of the partial test ban treaty negotiated in Moscow. There will be much said about the risks claimed to be reduced or eliminated by the arrangement. There will be little or nothing said by the administration about the risks it increases or creates. Unless these latter are understood thoroughly, assessed, and then balanced against the former, it is impossible to say whether the Moscow arrangement is in the national interest of the United States, whether it is detrimental to these interests, or whether the entire affair is no more than a meaningless exercise in futility.

That such risks do, in fact, exist, we can be sure. Unless Mr. Khrushchev is a madman, and he is not, he sees advantages for the Soviet Union and communism in the partial treaty. He sees them as substantial advantages, worthy of his time and effort. By no stretch

responsibility for making a study with a view to comprehensive plans for employment in the future. This is a problem, and it is a problem. All men will in both political and economic spheres find the solution. This resolution will win support from my colleagues in every political persuasion.

We need to know what deficiencies of Government or business policy have created the present unemployment problems.

We need to know what positive and constructive changes in Government policy, in the business world, in education and commerce can provide the broad expansion of enterprise that will be required to provide full employment for the growing labor force.

Mr. Speaker, it is a common error to think of the 4.8 million who are unemployed today in terms of the 20 million who were unemployed during the depression of the 1930's. The two situations are not parallel.

#### NATURE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

In 1930 a worldwide depression threw millions of people out of work, and the situation continued with little improvement until World War II began. There was nothing selective about the problem of unemployment in the thirties. It brought hardship on everyone, in every nation of the world.

Today's problem is selective. In the first place, there is no worldwide economic distress. The defeated nations of World War II are operating at high capacity with full employment, and some of them must import workers from other nations. Even in the United States, we are not in a business recession. The rate of business activity fluctuates from year to year, but the rate of unemployment remains at a high level affecting certain groups of people in our land.

Samuel Lubell has written a series of articles, which appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Canton Repository, in which he discusses in plain terms the nature of the unemployment problem of the sixties.

He points out, for example, that there are several hundred thousand young men, some of them approaching 30, who have never had a steady job. Perhaps my constituent is one of these. They are willing and anxious to work and have some training, but there appears to be no real place for them in the economy of the sixties. Consider what this means in terms of lost opportunities to own a home, start a family, take an adult's place in the American society. This is one part of the unemployment picture and it is a real tragedy.

There are others who trained for a specific job and who may have built up years of seniority in a plant, only to become unemployed when changing markets or technology eliminate the industry for which they are working or the job for which they are trained. We recognize this problem. It is a part of the current crisis in the rail industry.

There are, of course, the unemployed of all ages in areas which are acutely depressed such as the coal fields in certain parts of West Virginia, Ohio, Illinois and Tennessee. The unemployables who lack education or training are found everywhere in the United States and they are of both sexes and of all ages.

A youth conservation corps or an area redevelopment program is not going to solve the problems of these unemployed Americans. At best, such programs can provide only a short-term opportunity to earn some money after which, in the absence of a constructive solution to the Nation's problems, the men concerned will reenter the ranks of the unemployed. With regard to the youth corps, for example, the Secretary of Labor has testified that the men who go through this program will return with no new skills.

Mr. Lubell points out also that current statistics about unemployment are an unreliable index to the extent of the problem.

We are appalled to find that 4.8 million Americans are still unemployed according to the July 1 report of the Department of Labor but, as I indicated earlier and as Lubell agrees, this numerical expression of the problem is not the whole story. Many of the 4.8 million are people who are between jobs, men and women taking advantage of unemployment compensation to rest a few weeks, youngsters, housewives, and retirees seeking part-time work and many who would like to work or are willing to work but suffer no acute hardship by reason of being unemployed.

This does not lessen the seriousness of the problem for those I have mentioned who are numbered among the hard-core unemployed and those who inevitably must join this group unless constructive action is had soon.

#### SCOPE OF STUDY

The select committee I propose would include two members of each of the Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, and Ways and Means. The committee will be charged with responsibility for a full and complete study of the problem of unemployment in the United States with a view to recommending a comprehensive plan for the achievement of maximum employment in the private enterprise system. This study shall include, but shall not be limited to—

First. Chronic unemployment among persons aged 45 and over.

Second. The role of women in the labor force.

Third. Unemployment of young people, including the problems of school dropouts and the effect of compulsory military service.

Fourth. Apprenticeship and on-job training in industry.

Fifth. Federal, State, and nongovernmental agencies for placement of the unemployed.

Sixth. Vocational education in high schools.

Seventh. Industry programs for up-grading skills.

Eighth. The effects of automation.

Ninth. The effects of foreign competition.

Tenth. The effect of Federal taxation on industrial expansion.

A similar committee of Republican members only was proposed 2 years ago as a means of developing information for our party on these subjects. This proposal was contained in the excellent report called "Employment in the Dynamic American Economy" which included statements and studies by a number of our colleagues and papers prepared by distinguished academic and professional experts. I commend these reports to your attention. They appeared in the RECORDS of July 20, 25, 26, and 27, and August 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10, 1961.

It is my thought that a similar but much broader bipartisan study is urgently needed at this time. I hope that the Select Committee on the Problems of Employment may be established without delay and that its studies may produce programs that will solve the problems of unemployed men who need jobs, including my constituent, whose letter I read to you today.

#### U.S.S.R. NATIONALITIES IN DANGER OF EXTINCTION

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. Bow) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman continues the negotiations in Moscow which are supposedly limited to a discussion of a nuclear test ban.

However, public statements have also been made of the possibility of a non-aggression pact between the NATO Alliance and the Soviet Warsaw Pact nations which if developed, would mean complete acceptance by the United States of Communist control of previously free peoples in Eastern Europe.

In effect, we would be placing our stamp of approval on the Iron Curtain and would be crushing the hopes and aspirations of the captive peoples of the Soviet colonial empire for a return to legitimate governments of their own choosing.

We have had many reports from the Soviet Union in the past years indicating the continuing nationalistic resistance that the captive peoples are waging against Soviet imperialism. We have also been informed authoritatively of the persecution which the Soviet Government carries on against the unwilling captives of communism.

At this point I wish to insert into the RECORD as part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in the Haftenik Weekly of July 18, a publication of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, entitled "U.S.S.R. Nationalities in Danger of Extinction":

#### U.S.S.R. NATIONALITIES IN DANGER OF EXTINCTION

That the Armenians are in the forefront in the current drive for the creation of a congressional Committee for Captive Nations is

1963

of the imagination can such advantages to him be assumed to be, in any substantial part, advantages which also accrue to us. There must, therefore, in substantial part, be disadvantages to us.

Another reason for a hard look at risks inherent in the partial test ban treaty is to dispel the general feeling of euphoria it might create. People will tend to regard it as evidencing an easy solvability of East-West relationships. Pressures will mount for concessions all along the line to achieve a detente with communism. First, a nonaggression declaration, next a summit conference, then concessions here, there, and at many points which, when taken together, will add up not to solution of East-West relations, but to the tragic shift of strategic superiority to Communist hands. Misconceptions already prevalent concerning the Sino-Soviet dispute amply illustrate the pitfalls of miscalculating Communist intentions. Wishful thinkers view it as a fundamental split in Communist ranks. Realistically, it concerns in no way whether the West shall be buried. Only in dispute are the subsidiary questions of: when? and how?

#### MILITARY CONSEQUENCES OF THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

First. U.S. progress in high yield, 30- to 100-megaton weapons will be paralyzed at a time when the Soviets already have achieved these capabilities. The United States gives up entirely its opportunity to cope with the Soviet's massive program of hardening its offensive intercontinental missile bases.

The consequent inability to mete out destruction to Soviet weaponry will decrease the credibility of our deterrent force in direct ratio to increases in Soviet hardening. It is equivalent to cutting back our SAC air squadrons, ICBM bases, and Polaris submarine patrols.

Sufficient Soviet base hardening will progressively leave us threatening only empty launching pads or invulnerable hardened sites. This cannot be expected to deter the Soviets from initiating nuclear war. Our only alternative under these conditions would be to target Soviet cities, which hardly squares with the administration's no city deterrent-targeting doctrine.

Second. U.S. progress in antimissile defense will be either greatly slowed down or paralyzed completely at a time when, according to Khrushchev, the Soviets have solved the problem of antimissile defense. It is to be noted that Soviet claims in the nuclear field have generally been accurate. Their claim relative to having achieved the H-bomb is a notable example. When made, many in the United States scoffed. Nonetheless, it turned out to be quite accurate. The massive construction program now going on at Leningrad's missile defense sites lends credence to the estimate that the Soviets have what they claim regarding ICBM defense and are installing it.

Antimissile defense capability in the hands of the Soviet Union is another way of saying our deterrent against Soviet attack has weakened. It, too, is the equivalent of cutting back our SAC air squadrons, ICBM bases, and Polaris fleet.

If the warheads carried by these delivery systems are to be intercepted by Soviet defenses with any degree of efficiency, then they will not loom large as deterrents to Soviet button pushers.

Conversely, the absence of U.S. anti-missile capability permits a Soviet first-strike, surprise attack to get through, destroy our deterrent forces before they are put in operation, and thus further reduce U.S. power to deter. Destroyed weapons cannot impose damage upon the Soviet Union greater than can be accepted in return for accomplishment of the Communist objective of world domination. This situation cannot be remedied except by improvement of U.S. anti-missile capabilities. This cannot be done well, it cannot be done readily, perhaps it cannot be done at all without atmospheric testing.

Third. The partial test ban treaty introduces the completely new hazard and risk to America of surprise abrogation. This is the situation where, under the cover of the partial treaty, Soviet nuclear weapons scientists would be put to work intensely in weapons laboratories behind the secrecy of the Iron Curtain, all test preparations would be made in strictest secrecy, then the Soviet Government suddenly would announce itself no longer bound by the treaty and promptly initiate an extensive test series.

During this period, which might last for years, U.S. laboratory work would deteriorate in quantity and quality and our capabilities for atmospheric testing also would deteriorate. The net effect would be a quantum jump in Soviet nuclear capabilities which might well gain them decisive nuclear superiority. Under such conditions, the West could expect at the worst a nuclear Pearl Harbor and at best a surrender or *de ultimatum*.

Fourth. As an alternate to surprise abrogation the Kremlin might simply direct its nuclear laboratories to concentrate exclusively on areas of nuclear development concerned with highly efficient tactical nuclear weapons. This could include the neutron bomb. This type of development can be done conveniently underground. It could be done by the Soviets safely under partial test ban conditions because they are assured that we are not making other nuclear developments with which they must compete.

In any event, we do know that the Soviet Union spends  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times the amount spent by the United States on basic military research. This indicates an aim at developing full spectrum military superiority in approximately a decade. This fits well either with the surprise abrogation timetable or with the tactical-neutron development timetable.

Unless one is to be wholly and totally naive, one cannot with any assurance anticipate that Soviet weapons funds released by the partial test ban will be reallocated to consumer goods production. This "refrigerator" argument simply fails to square with any past action ever taken by Communist leaders. Put another way, we can be absolutely certain that whatever financial advantages the Soviet Union finds in the partial test ban treaty will be utilized to perfect its arsenals, not better its standard of living.

Fifth. If all, or any substantial portion of the foregoing disadvantages occur and result in debilitation of the American deterrent, it is axiomatic that Communist leaders will intensify their efforts in the cold war areas of conflict between East and West. It could even lead to easier decisions by Communist leaders to engage in limited conventional warfare. This is simply because today, the fearful capacity of the American deterrent cautions Communist leaders against risking lesser types of conflict which might escalate into a nuclear exchange. Any reduction in the relative fearfulness of that deterrent makes it easier for them to be more adventurous in choosing actions which might escalate. Conversely, it places us in a weaker position to control such actions. The threat of nuclear response, heretofore a handy lid to place on them, becomes progressively smaller, less credible, and less effective.

#### POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PARTIAL TEST BAN TREATY

First. Heretofore the U.S. policy of nondissemination of nuclear weapons; that is, the policy against proliferation of weapons to numerous countries, has been a matter of discretion. The partial test ban treaty will commit us indefinitely to the policy. We will not be able to change it without abrogating or at least violating the treaty.

(a) With respect to our NATO allies, this comes at a time when the U.S. policy is seriously weakening the alliance. If the partial treaty results in weakening our deterrent capabilities, as outlined above, Europeans will become less and less inclined to follow our lead. The estrangement will deepen. European defenses will weaken and the dissolution of NATO could well follow. This, for years, has been one of Premier Khrushchev's priority objectives.

(b) With respect to the situation in the Far East, our options in meeting the threat of emerging nuclear capabilities on the part of the Red Chinese will be seriously restricted. It will be impossible to work closely with Japan in creating a nuclear deterrent. The full burden of deterrence will fall on the United States, at the very time its overall deterrent capabilities are seriously weakened because of the treaty.

Second. Any adverse effect on the American deterrent consequent to the treaty is certain to accelerate, rather than decelerate efforts of other countries to obtain their own independent national deterrents. Even if we choose to weaken ourselves, they may not. Proliferation will occur under other countries' terms, not under terms which the United States might impose to make the consequences of proliferation less risky.

It is readily apparent that the partial test treaty raises almost as many difficulties, problems, and risks to U.S. security as a comprehensive treaty. The chief difference is that the U.S.S.R. can conduct underground tests without violating the pact. We still will be unable to determine accurately what underground testing programs they will be carrying on.

# JUSTICE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG RECEIVES DOCTOR OF LAWS AT YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 1963, the Yeshiva University honored the distinguished Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Arthur J. Goldberg, when it conferred upon him the degree of doctor of laws for a career in public service which was crowned by his appointment to the Supreme Court last year.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following presentation of Rabbi Joseph Lookstein and Justice Goldberg's address on the occasion of Yeshiva's 32d annual commencement:

## PRESENTATION OF THE HONORABLE ARTHUR GOLDBERG

(By Rabbi Joseph Lookstein)

Mr. President, when our eminent guest was Secretary of Labor he was frequently referred to as the Davy Crockett of the New Frontier. He was fond of that appellation because it intimated courage, daring, and vision.

The raccoon hat and the buckskin tunic have since been exchanged for the dignified judicial robe. But the qualities of courage, daring, and vision still remain the proud possessions of the learned, dynamic, and sagacious Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Honorable Arthur Joseph Goldberg.

He is the son of a Russian-Jewish immigrant, the youngest of 11 children. Orphaned of his pious father at the tender age of 8, he learned early in life the pain of adversity and the pangs of hardship. He speaks of himself as an "academic moonlighter," attending Crane Junior College in the morning and De Paul University at night and working in between.

His humble beginnings and admirable perseverance call to mind another youth—the tall, gaunt, and saintly fellow-Illinoisan whose name is holy legend in American history.

It is out of such struggle that character is distilled and noble ambitions inspired. The passion for freedom, justice, and equality is nurtured, often enough, not in palaces and mansions, but in log cabins and in immigrant huts. In such environments, social prophets are made and our distinguished guest is one of them.

Renown has not affected him; prominence did not obscure his essential humanity. Amidst public acclaim he can still hear the cry of the aggrieved and anguished. Neath the black robe beats, even more strongly than before, a warm, compassionate and understanding heart.

It is gratifying to realize that this commanding national figure proudly identifies himself with the fortunes of his people and with the traditions of his faith. Many a Cabinet member and Supreme Court Justice who were guests at the Seder service at his home will attest to that.

Mr. President, in his latest opinion written but days ago, our guest defines the phrase "with all deliberate speed" as it applies to the vexing problem of desegregation. For him, it means that the pernicious evil of race discrimination should be removed from our midst forthwith and without delay.

In keeping with the Jewish principle of "measure for measure," it is appropriate sir, that we confer upon Arthur Joseph Goldberg "with all deliberate speed" the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, U.S. SUPREME COURT, YESHIVA UNIVERSITY, JUNE 13, 1963

Mr. President, distinguished rabbis and teachers, this is a redundancy, distinguished guests, graduates, their families and friends. This weekend, and during the last week all over America, commencements were being held.

I would like to tell you in all candor that this commencement has the first claim on my heart. I must tell you that it does not. It has the second claim as my son is graduating on Sunday and obviously that commencement has the first claim on me.

Every commencement speaker has difficulty in defending his role. If Lincoln's great address had any statement most applicable to commencement speeches it was the phrase that a commencement speech is little noted and long remembered. In fact the principal purpose of a commencement speech is kind of to tide over between processional and recessional. It reminded me very vividly of an experience I had just the other day of the same type or I should say of a related type.

I knew when I assumed the high office of the Justice of the Supreme Court, that I was charged with many responsibilities—grave ones indeed—and I was vested under our constitutional system to have extraordinary powers which have challenged the thinking and sometimes raised the doubts of political scientists here and all over the world. The power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, the powers to set aside the actions of the Chief Executive of the Nation, the powers to set aside acts of States as unconstitutional.

I must confess that as a lawyer I know that I had those responsibilities and powers and was gravely conscious of this but I did not know that a Justice of the Supreme Court was vested by the laws of the District of Columbia with the powers to perform marriages, and I discovered this just not so long ago. (Joke about Army soldier who wants to get married on a weekend without proper license. GI asks Justice for a few words to tide couple over.) I shall in this address make a few remarks to tide the graduates over between coming in and coming out.

I am deeply honored to receive this degree from Yeshiva University, greatly respected as it is for its outstanding scholarship and for its uncompromising devotion to intellectual pursuits in the great Jewish tradition.

As an outstanding rabbinical school and a higher institution of learning, Yeshiva University continues to demonstrate that fidelity to Judaism is lawful devotion to the moral heritage upon which our country was founded, and which informs all civilization.

I have discovered in my career that the role of the public official, executive, or judicial, and the role of the scholar, the educated person, are not widely separated, as some believe.

For both executive and judge must depend upon the illumination of the religious sage, the philosopher, the historian, the scholar, to light the way. If we seek as we must seek to lift the poor and deprived and suppressed to better conditions and wider opportunities, if we pursue equal justice for all extending to all the equal protection of the law it is because the prophets, the speculative thinkers, the contemplative men throughout recorded times have inquired into the higher reasons for society, for government and, indeed, life itself. I believe that the ivory tower is a complete fiction. There is no possibility today for noninvolvement in a world in which the salvation of the human race is at stake, nor can there for the average citizen be disengagement from the responsibilities the free man accepts as a part of his birthright. It is freedom itself that imposes this burden upon those who cherish their freedom.

It is commonplace to say that we live in troubled times. Though we have lived in

troubled times ever since I sat in your place in 1929, and in 1930, and in 1931, when we were on the eve of terrible events which challenged the very existence of our civilization.

We are in perilous times today and while judges, sworn to, and performing their duties of interpreting the law, can issue decisions which express the conviction that our society by our Constitution is an open society and while Presidents can speak to the Nation and propose legislation to that end and while legislators can deal with the laws that can give strength, vitality, and force to that concept, ultimately these precepts which are the basis for our society will prevail and depend upon you. It will depend upon graduates here and the average man and woman here in the United States. This does not mean that judges cannot educate, that presidents cannot enforce the law and inspire the people and legislators cannot legislate.

This does mean that the sum total of our achievements for the type of society upon which our hopes exist will depend upon the people of the United States, and their dedication to the basic principles of equality and to use our Biblical term from which these principles derive of justice and righteousness and indeed the great challenge of the present hour in America is the response of the people to their commitments to citizenship in our country. Moral commitments if you will, far more than law can or should enforce. But the fact that they are moral commitments does not mean that they do not profoundly effect the course of ways and the future of our country.

The pursuit of education in my opinion has a double and related function. It must, of course, inform the mind, sharpen it; that is one of the purposes. It must also fuel the belly of the student. Unless an education makes you passionately devoted to what is going to be in life, to the great issues of today and tomorrow, and commits you to the obligations that you have toward those issues, the education that you get is a complete failure.

I believe that scholarship, that higher education, have a higher purpose than intellectual satisfaction and stimulation that comes from pursuing the engrossing story of man's culture and meaning; that higher meaning is not only to illuminate the present but to inspire it.

This is one of the things that makes this university appealing to me, and that is that it is founded upon the principle which the Jewish heritage strongly emphasizes: that a man must turn inward and set the true value on our days and works, define the purposes for which we spend the years God has granted to us and ask whether freedom and individual liberty prosper in our cause.

We have been much concerned, as we have had to be throughout all of the time that the graduates of this institution can remember, with foreign affairs. Because if we are not successful abroad, then the survival of freedom is endangered. Again I would like to say to you that I wish that there is as much interest, dedication and devotion to domestic matters as well. We cannot be successful abroad unless we are successful at home.

The measure of our success at home is what we do to make the fruits of our life available to the poor, to the underprivileged, to the prejudiced against, to the discriminated against.

The measure of our success at home is likewise the quality of our institutions. It is to be found in respect for law and obedience to it, by governor and governed alike, in the resolute and enlightened leadership of our executive, in the fully representative character of our legislatures; in the impartiality and integrity of our judiciary and in the moral and ethical standards of our citizens.